

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the RCE filed herewith, and in view of the amendments, and the discussion that follows. Claims 1-4, 6-25, and 27-33 are pending in this application. A request for a two-month extension of time and the required fee is also enclosed herewith.

Claims 1-4, 6-25, and 27-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,665,395 to Busey et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,765 to Crowther et al. After a careful review of the claims (as amended), it has been concluded that the claims are allowable and allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

All the pending claims have been rejected as being obvious over Busey et al. in view of Crowther et al. In response, independent claims 1, 13, 21, and 22 have been amended to clarify "media type."

Media type is defined in the application as referring to the source or access channel over which the call is processed (p.4, 2nd para.) which is clearly distinguishable from the agent's skills to which Crowther is addressed. The claims have been amended to clarify that this is the meaning defined in the application (see p. 4) of media type. Since interrupt levels in Crowther are assigned to skill sets, they do not teach or suggest the exclusive or non-exclusive media types of the application, and there is no teaching to support applying the Crowther interrupt to the media types of the claims.


The Examiner has asserted that media type determines the type of request that needs to be handled by an agent with a particular skill set citing the example in Crowther of an agent logged into a telephone (col. 3, lines 60-67). However, that is merely an instance in which a specific agent is physically able to receive only telephone calls, not one in which the system determines the media type as exclusive or a non-exclusive, but rather defines the given agent as receiving exclusively telephone calls. This did not even prevent the agent from receiving other calls while handling the first. The Examiner further asserts that Crowther (at col. 6, lines 55-56) teaches an uninterruptability level of 1 for some calls which cannot be interrupted. However, this is a priority level attached to

the agent's skills and not the media type. ("agent 330 is logged into...skill sets at priority levels p1."). Thus, interruptability levels in Crowther are based on agent skill sets, not media type. Thus, there is no teaching that supports applying interrupts to media types and no support for using interrupt levels of 1 for media type exclusivity. Accordingly, Busey and Crowther cannot be combined to render the independent claims 1, 13, 21 and 22 obvious. Therefore, claims 1, 13, 21 and 22 are believed to be allowable.

The remaining dependent claims 2-4, 6-12, 14-20, 23-25, and 27-33 depend on an allowable base claims and include additional, novel subject matter of the invention. Therefore, applicant believes that these claims are also allowable.

Allowance of claims 1-4, 6-25 and 27-33, as now presented is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By 
James A. Scheer
Registration No. 29,434

March 6, 2006
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500